

U.S. Institute of Peace; therefore, I was deeply disappointed and surprised that Bishop Palmer's nomination to the U.S. Institute of Peace has been stalled at the White House for over a year now, and his name was not included in the nominations to be considered by the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

I am hopeful that the White House will reconsider and send his nomination to the HELP Committee before Wednesday, tomorrow, when we are due to act upon other nominations. We have one nomination that has come down to be renominated to the U.S. Institute of Peace. I am certain this person will have no problem being renominated. But I was very surprised, as I said, and disappointed that Bishop Palmer's name, which has been at the White House for 1 year now—1 year his nomination has been sitting there, and I know of no opposition to Bishop Palmer. As I said, he is head of the Methodist Church for the entire State of Iowa. He is known nationally and internationally. I cannot think of a more qualified person to be on the board of the U.S. Institute of Peace.

I am quite upset with this, and I hope that the White House will reconsider this nomination. It would not take but just about half an hour to transmit his name here, and I wish they would do that before we meet tomorrow so we can report his name out and get Bishop Palmer on the board of directors as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ELECTION CONTEST

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in the world of politics, every election seems to test the bottom when it comes to mudslinging. I am afraid this year's election contest is no exception, and it is plummeting hitherto uncharted depths.

Some of the things that have been said on both sides I am sure on reflection are going to be the source of some embarrassment, and some of the actions taken by both campaigns will be regretted in the future. But there is one particular element in this debate in the Presidential campaign that I find particularly bothersome. It relates to statements that have been made by Vice President CHENEY, by the Speaker of the House, DENNIS HASTERT, and by Members of the Senate, and others, relative to the patriotism of candidates for office and relative to questions as to whether the American people, by casting their vote one way or the other

on November 2, are somehow inviting terrorism to strike America.

Vice President CHENEY, at a political rally in Des Moines, IA, Tuesday, September 7, said:

It's absolutely essential that 8 weeks from today, on November 2, we make the right choice, because if we make the wrong choice, then the danger is that we'll get hit again and we'll be hit in a way that will be devastating from the standpoint of the United States. And we'll fall back into the pre-9/11 mindset, if you will, that in fact these terrorist attacks are just criminal acts and that we're not really at war.

This quote by the Vice President received a lot of attention. The clear suggestion by the Vice President is that if the American people should not vote for President Bush, they are inviting a terrorist attack. That is an outrageous statement. I think it is one that, frankly, Vice President CHENEY on reflection might not have made. Would it be appropriate to argue that since the terrorists attacked the United States while he was serving as Vice President, they saw weakness in the Bush-Cheney administration? I would not make that preposterous charge. I do not believe anyone can. And yet here we have the Vice President suggesting that if you do not vote to reelect President Bush, you are inviting a terrorist attack on the United States.

Just last Saturday in DeKalb, IL, the Speaker of the House, DENNIS HASTERT, was quoted as saying:

I don't have data or intelligence to tell me one thing or another, (but) I would think they would be more apt to go (for) somebody who would file a lawsuit with the World Court or something rather than respond with troops.

Speaker HASTERT said that of JOHN KERRY.

Asked by reporters whether he believed al-Qaida could operate better with KERRY in the White House, HASTERT replied:

That's my opinion, yes.

I think this is a new low in American politics. For us to suggest that either major political party would field a candidate who would in any way knowingly or unknowingly compromise the security and safety of the United States I believe is a charge that must be backed up with solid evidence if it is ever going to be leveled. In this case, Speaker HASTERT said, "I don't have data or intelligence to tell me one thing or another. . . ."

The reason I believe this is important is that when we reach the point in a campaign when the Vice President suggests that a vote for JOHN KERRY invites a terrorist attack on our country, and the Speaker of the House, after acknowledging he has no information to support his statement, joins Mr. CHENEY with the chorus of "vote for Bush or die," not to be outdone—and let me make it clear, I put "vote for Bush or die" in quotes. That is my statement. I am not attributing that to either of those individuals. So we have a situation where this has become a standard charge in the campaign at the highest levels.

There was a time in American politics when people were circumspect about even raising the issue of the fact that the former Governor of Illinois, Adlai Stevenson, had been divorced. In the 1950s, it was not really considered to be appropriate to raise that in the national debate, although there were certainly a lot of rumors and murmuring in the background.

Now we see the debate on the Presidential level reaching what I think are new depths, where at the highest levels questions are being raised as to whether JOHN KERRY would, in fact, defend the United States against a terrorist attack. I think that is a troubling development.

These are not the only statements that have been made. This morning on the Fox News Channel one of my colleagues, whom I work with on a regular basis, Senator HATCH of Utah, raised the same issue. Others have as well.

We saw in the debate last Saturday where John Thune, a former Congressman of South Dakota, was debating Senator TOM DASCHLE, the Democratic minority leader. In the course of their debate, he argued that the fact TOM DASCHLE had been critical of the Bush administration's policies in Iraq "emboldened the enemy." John Thune said that TOM DASCHLE's words emboldened the enemy.

What we have reached is the point where any criticism of our foreign policy leads to the charge that we are not being patriotic, leads to the charge that we would not stand up to defend America, and leads to the charge that in some respects the terrorists would be emboldened by those comments and our troops would be demoralized.

So what does that tell us? If Members of the Senate on either side of the aisle stand up and are critical of our policy in Iraq, are they to be targeted then as somehow selling out America, somehow guilty of traitorous comments? That is what we can draw from these comments made by Republican leaders as well as Republican candidates.

Yet Senator HARKIN made a statement earlier in the day which noted the obvious. Even Republican Senators are being critical today of our policy in Iraq. This last Sunday, Senator CHUCK HAGEL, a Republican of Nebraska, said, in reference to Iraq: The fact is, we are in trouble. We are in deep trouble in Iraq.

Do we embolden the enemy by being critical of our policy in Iraq? I do not think so. I think it is part of the normal political discourse which one expects in a democracy.

Similarly, Senator RICHARD LUGAR, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, a friend of mine and colleague from the State of Indiana, criticized what he called the incompetence in the administration that has resulted in the failed Iraq reconstruction effort.

Does he embolden the enemy, demoralize the troops, by pointing out these shortcomings in American foreign policy? He is a Republican Senator. I have

not heard Vice President CHENEY or any others criticize Senators such as LUGAR or HAGEL for making these comments.

Senator John McCain said recently: We are not winning. Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM said that we need to be "more honest about how difficult it will be" in Iraq.

The list goes on, and the list tells me that Senators of good conscience on both sides of the aisle feel an obligation to disagree with the President on foreign policy when they have an honest disagreement and to suggest that changes in foreign policy or changes in military policy are important for the security of America.

I do not know if Vice President CHENEY or the Speaker of the House would criticize the fact I have been openly critical of some of the military decisions that have been made since the invasion of Iraq. When a man comes into my office and tells me his son is a military policeman in Iraq and because he cannot be issued body armor he and his wife were raising money at home to buy the body armor and send it to their son, I came to the floor to criticize that. Of the billions of dollars we have sent in preparation for this war, one would think it obvious that body armor would be one of the first things issued to our soldiers. In this case, it was not.

I was critical of the administration, critical of our policies, critical of foreign policy and military policy. Would Vice President CHENEY argue that I am giving comfort to the enemy by suggesting that? I certainly hope not.

When we found that our Humvees were sitting targets for homemade bombs and rocket-propelled grenades, that we had been remiss in failing to equip our Humvees in Iraq with armor plating on the sides to protect our soldiers, many of us came to the floor and made that point, wrote letters to the administration, forced a change in policy, which resulted in more and more of these Humvees being reconstructed, refit with armor to protect the troops.

Does the fact we were critical of the administration raise some question as to whether we are demoralizing the troops? Exactly the opposite occurred. When the Humvees arrived with the armor, our troops' morale went up. They had a chance to survive the attack. They did not have it before.

So Members of Congress—from Senator KERRY, through Republican and Democratic Senators alike—have a moral obligation to raise those issues where they disagree with this administration on foreign policy or military policy, whether they are on the Republican side of the aisle or the Democratic side of the aisle. This debate which we have seen disintegrate and descend to the levels that I have referred to needs to come to an end.

This is not the first time those in the highest levels of political office in Washington have questioned the patriotism of others in political office, have

questioned whether they have the national security of America paramount in their mind. The same thing occurred in the 1950s. A Republican Senator from Wisconsin named Joe McCarthy went about throwing charges at people right and left that they were not loyal to America; that they were, in fact, communist. He destroyed a lot of people. He destroyed a lot of careers in the process.

There came a time in the course of the Army hearings with Senator McCarthy where finally one voice spoke out. That voice turned to Senator McCarthy and said: Have you no shame?

The same question needs to be asked of those who are throwing around so loosely these charges that either JOHN KERRY, JOHN EDWARDS, or TOM DASCHLE do not have the best interests of the United States at heart in everything that they do.

I disagree many times with my colleagues on the floor when it comes to foreign policy, military policy, and many other issues. Yet I have never and will never ever question their patriotism. I believe that is beyond the pale of ordinary political discourse. It has now become common conversation in this Presidential campaign.

On November 2, the voters will have the opportunity to ask the candidates who use these low tactics, Have you no shame?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR INTELLIGENCE REFORM

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, today our Appropriations Committee held a hearing and listened to distinguished individuals as to their views on the recommendations for intelligence reform. At that time, we were provided a statement which is entitled "Guiding Principles for Intelligence Reform" dated September 21, 2004. It is signed by the following persons: former Senator David Boren, former Senator Bill Bradley, former Secretary of Defense Frank Carlucci, former Secretary of Defense William Cohen, former CIA Director Robert Gates, former Deputy Secretary of Defense John Hamre, former Senator and Presidential candidate Gary Hart, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, former Senator Sam Nunn, former Senator Warren Rudman, and former Secretary of State George Shultz.

I do call it to the attention of all Senators in connection with this current review of the 9/11 Commission recommendations on intelligence reform.

I ask unanimous consent that the "Guiding Principles for Intelligence Reform" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR INTELLIGENCE REFORM

America's security depends on strengthening our intelligence collection and anal-

ysis. Debate is under way on intelligence reform, and harnessing the energy of an election season is a healthy way to assure the issue receives the attention it deserves. Racing to implement reforms on an election timetable is precisely the wrong thing to do. Intelligence reform is too complex and too important to undertake at a campaign's breakneck speed. Based on our experience in both the executive and legislative branches of the U.S. government and on both sides of the political aisle, these are the basic principles we believe should guide any reform effort:

IDENTIFY THE PROBLEMS

Rushing in with solutions before we understand all the problems is a recipe for failure. Only after a full appreciation of the Intelligence Community's problems—and its strengths—can sensible decisions be made about reform, including whether to restructure. Moreover, reform will have to be comprehensive to succeed. Addressing this or that shortcoming—however grave—in isolation will fail to produce the improvement in intelligence capabilities our nation's security demands.

STRENGTHEN THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY'S LEADER

The individual responsible for leading the Intelligence Community must be empowered with authority commensurate with his or her responsibility. Specifically and crucially, future leaders must have the ability to align personnel and resources with national intelligence priorities. Whether we maintain the Intelligence Community's current structure or create a new one, we must ensure that the Intelligence Community's leader has the tools to do his or her job.

SEPARATE INTELLIGENCE FROM POLICY

A fundamental principle for Intelligence Community reform must be that the intelligence community remains independent from policymakers. Nothing could be more important to a healthy national security structure. When intelligence and policy are too closely tied, the demands of policymakers can distort intelligence and intelligence analysts can hijack the policy development process. It is crucial to ensuring this separation that the Intelligence Community leader have no policy role. Otherwise, an Intelligence Community leader's voice could overwhelm those of Cabinet secretaries and the National Security Advisor and deprive the President of the benefit of robust, informed policy debate. A single individual with the last word on intelligence and a say in policy as well could be a dangerously powerful actor in the national security arena—using intelligence to advocate for particular policy positions, budget requests, or weapons systems that others lacked the knowledge to challenge.

For this reason, the leader of the Intelligence Community should not work inside the White House; he or she should be at arm's length from the policy process, not at the President's right hand. Nor should the leader become an instrument of diplomacy or policy formulation; his or her role should be to support others in these functions. Similarly, Intelligence Community reform must not rob Cabinet secretaries of their own ability to assess intelligence by centralizing the bulk of assessment resources; the secretaries must be able to turn to their own analysts for independent perspective and be able to task the Intelligence Community leader for input to the policymaking process. Finally, to protect against an unhealthy mixing of functions, we believe the person who is chosen to lead the Intelligence Community should be broadly acceptable to both parties and chosen for his or her substantive or management expertise.